ABSTRACT
        The staff-development process in a small community
college that has no full-time Educational Development Officer is
described. The process is discussed in relation to faculty
improvement meetings, professional improvement meetings, staff and
program development fund, federally funded projects,
vocational/technical grants, departmental and individual
faculty/staff projects, and grant applications for 1974-75. The
schoolwide objectives for the faculty/staff/program improvement are
provided. The methods of meeting the objectives are discussed in
relation to faculty mini-workshops. The improvement program is
described in the three areas of: methods of improving instruction,
critical issues, and the use of nationally known consultants. The
Florida system of staff and program development funds and
coordination of the statewide program are sketched. Twelve faculty
development meetings held during 1973-74 are listed. (DB)

How Staff Development Works in The Small Community College

By Dr. Clyde C. Clements, Jr.
Director of Program Development
Lake City Community College
Lake City, Florida

I want to describe working on staff development in the small, innovative community college which cannot afford a full-time Educational Development Officer. Lake City Community College is a small college of 2000 students located in rural North Central Florida with an instructional staff of under 100. Yet our college has a long standing commitment to innovation. And the diverse background of the faculty needed to staff the comprehensive curriculum makes staff development paramount. On the technical side our faculty frequently needs assistance on how to teach their skill. In both the transfer and technical divisions the faculty needs added exposure to the concept of the open door, the comprehensive curriculum, community services, and the understanding of the background of the community college student. Instructional strategies to accommodate diverse students including the use of performance objectives, and packaging, computer-assisted instruction and media support have been staff development priorities this year.

I am Director of Program Development. Let me describe the functions of the office:

> The Office of Program Development provides a systems approach to academic improvement that involves faculty committees in cooperation with the President's Administrative Council to establish priorities. By this cooperation

all aspects of academic improvement focus on meeting
college objectives with an emphasis on meaningful
innovation.
The Director of Program Development serves as the
professional staff advisor on program development for
the college, keeping the president, vice president,
and administrative council advised of trends in extra-
budgetary support that might affect policy or long-range
plans. The Development Officer also assists in staff
development plans of the college to improve teaching
and insure a learner-oriented program. (Administrative
Handbook, Lake City Community College.)

I have spent 30-40 percent of my time on staff development

plans in the academic year of 1973-74.

Our Academic Improvement Program was submitted and accepted

as an Exemplary Practice for Staff and Program Development by

the State Department of Education. Lake City Community College

had a year long commitment to staff development in the following

areas:

1. A major focus was our faculty development series, a monthly

mini-workshop in how to improve instruction and critical issues

for the community college educators. 2. Our staff and program

development fund monies from the State, which are controlled by

a staff committee, serve as direct initiative by the faculty

into the staff development process. 3. Our committee approach

to the grants idea, including writing up of a proposal request

calls for thinking through issues and focussing more clearly

on objectives for curriculum and instructional improvement by the

faculty. 4. Special programs such as the work of the Compen-

satory Education Task Force, called for growth on the part of

committee members, research, reading, site-visits, and awareness

of new concepts. Out of this came a revision of non-credit

progressive studies into a modularized, full-transfer credit

program with a human relations component.

In reviewing these four areas--faculty development series, staff and program development fund, the committee approach to grants, and the special task force on compensatory education, the first two are clearly within a narrow definition of staff development. I would contend, too, that faculty growth stimulated by our committee approach to grants, and our special faculty task force on compensatory education also contributed to inservice education.

This position would also be consistent with the interconnected policy funding of staff and program development by the State of Florida.

The total Academic Improvement Program may be viewed in this way:

PART I   Objectives

PART II   Faculty Improvement Meetings

PART III Professional Improvement Meetings

PART IV   Staff and Program Development Fund

PART V   Federally Funded Projects

PART VI   Vocational - Technical (SDE) Grants

PART VII Departmental and Individual
          Faculty/Staff Projects

PART VIII Grant Applications for 1974-75

Our schoolwide Objectives for the Faculty/Staff/Program

Improvement for 1973-74 are set down:

A. To provide all faculty with an orientation to CAI (computer-assisted instruction).

B. To provide all faculty with an orientation to individualizing instruction and writing performance objectives for at least one course (1973-74).

1) <u>Techincal Division</u>

    (a) To update syllabi and lesson plans by each instructor for one block/phase of his instruction.

    (b) To provide in-service education for faculty in "How to Teach."

    (c) Write performance objectives for at least one course during the year.

2) <u>Transfer Division</u>

    (a) Follow a system for improving the learning experience, <u>e.g.</u>, "CLMS."

    (b) Update syllabi; write one sample lesson plan for one course.

    (c) Write performance objectives for at least one course during the year.

    (d) Review and evaluate all pre-college, progressive studies courses--make plans for necessary changes. Prepare Compensatory Education Task Force Recommendation.

    (e) Involve all faculty in revision of general education requirements.

    (f) Initiate division-wide honors program.

    (g) Investigate CAI potential use in Transfer courses.

C. To implement the college long-range plan for CLMS, a Creative Learning Management System, 1974-1980.

    1. CLMS Committee Workshop 1/29/74

    2. CLMS Sub-Committees (Units 1-7), complete "PERT" for pilot model by March 30, 1974.

    3. Program pilot model in computer beginning in September, 1974.

D. To continue faculty/staff in-service education to meet the changing educational requirements of the college based on annual needs assessment.

To meet these objectives our faculty development series

of mini-workshops served as a principal vehicle. The year-long

program was in three areas: (1) <u>methods of improving instruction</u> through CAI, media support, and writing performance objectives; (2) <u>critical issues</u> like the four-day week, competency-based education, and non-punitive grading, featuring factual presentations, panels, and open discussion of each issue; (3) <u>natioahlly known consultants</u> like Dr. John Roueche and Dr. James Wattenbarger to discuss the community college goals and philosophy and work with the faculty.

Methods to Improve Instruction

The fall semester of the Faculty Development Series focussed on ways to improve instruction. In order to help the faculty become aware of new Learning Resources services and equipment the Media specialist, Tom McCracken, conducted a workshop with hands-on applications. The Director of the National Science Foundation funded training consortium for computer-assisted instruction, Robert Moore, explained how teams of circuit riders could help faculty to use CAI by visiting the campus once a week. Moore conducted a session in August nad again in December to make the faculty fully aware of the on-going chance to learn to use computer-assisted instruction. Faculty were trained to use both the leased terminal to the University of Florida and the new Lake City Community College mini-computer system installed by Director of Computing Activities, John Griffith.

In another area several consultants, Dr. Howard Kirk and Dr. Ron Peake, University of West Florida, assisted the Technical Division to meet the state mandate of specifying program objectives. Dean Walter Parnell and I provided informa-

tion and directions to Transfer faculty undertaking a similar task.

Critical Issues in Education

Burning issues proved to be a successful format. Research was done on a topical area important to the staff perception and acceptance such as competency-based instruction. This research was presented in a factual way to the faculty, either by a single speaker or a panel. Open discussion then took place. I well remember my presentation on competency-based instruction and the debate provoked by Benjamin Blooms' statement that up to ninety percent of students could achieve mastery if the time factor were flexible and instruction were fully individualized. Arthur Cohen's sample objectives took quite a scouring from the liberal arts faculty at that early October meeting. Yet by the Spring, faculty had met their deadline on program objectives and were coming to the office for individual help on course objectives and packaging.

Another burning issue was presented by President Phillips in the form of a proposal to put the school on the Four Day Week in response to the energy crisis. This issue was examined in faculty forum and by the students before it was adopted. A comprehensive assessment of the Four Day Week was done by staff psychologist, Clark Hardman, for the State Department of Education.

Perhaps, the most controversial issue of all was the proposed revision of the progressive studies program at Lake City Community College. After a four-month study by the Compensatory Education Task Force, which included visits to successful programs, and receiving advice from experts like

Dr. John Roueche, University of Texas, the proposal was sent
before the Curriculum Committee and Steering and Planning
Committee where it was endorsed. Faculty opinion had been
sampled in a November meeting chaired by Dean Parnell. Then
the Task Force was formed with me as Chairman, and a final
presentation was made in March by the Task Force. Dr. John
Roueche conducted a wrap up workshop in April on the implications
of open admissions and presented examples of successful compen-
satory programs around the country.

The result was that six of the seven recommendations
passed full faculty consent. In the Fall Lake City Community
College will have an individualized full credit system of
compensatory studies allowing the student to start at his own
level in math, English, or reading, and progress at his own
pace to completion of the performance objectives. Human Relations
and improved counseling will provide the "glue"--the study skills,
improvement in self-concept, and career and program counseling
so necessary to help former underachievers.

Use of Consultants

In our series aimed at improving instruction in the fall,
faculty reaction led me to believe that the presentation and
discussion of community college concepts would be essential to
the success of our program. Comments from the transfer faculty
indicated that some still held reference points to a four-year
liberal arts program and to graduate school standards rather
than the general education requirements of the community college.
And a number of the technical faculty indicated that they too,
needed help in accepting the concept of the open door, the com-

prehensive curriculum, community services, and the nature and background of the community college student. These points were the concepts called for by the EPDA Advisory Committee in their report, People for the People's Colleges. Wider dissemination of these concepts among community college staff was stressed.

We were fortunate to have close to us, Dr. James Wattenbarger of the University of Florida, the idea man of Florida community college movement. Dr. Wattenbarger's dissertation study metamorphosed over a period of a few years into the master plan for the Florida community college systems. Dr. Wattenbarger kicked off the spring series with a discussion of the goals and philosophy of the Florida community college movement. He traced the change from several small junior colleges to the system of twenty-eight colleges with an articulation agreement providing junior level transfer to the senior universities. He emphasized the aims and objectives of the system in its service to the citizenry of the state. The Chairman of our History Department told me that this was the best presentation ever brought to our campus.

Dr. Wattenbarger was on campus a full day as was Dr. John Roueche in his work with the faculty on individualization and compensatory education. Coffee, and an informal session is set up in the morning for those who can attend, followed by the mini-workshop sessions. Dr. Mary McCaulley, University of Florida, whose topic was the use of Myers-Briggs Personality Inventory in Education, and Dr. H. H. McAshan, University of North

Florida, whose topic was Behavioral Objectives for the Psycho-
Motor and Affective Areas and the Systems Approach, also had
sessions and mini-workshops in the same format during the
spring. I recommend this full day use of on-campus consultants
for promoting faculty change.

The full schedule of faculty development workshops is
attached.

In order to understand the Florida State system of staff
and program development funds, let me briefly sketch the background
as set forth in the publication, Staff and Program Development in
Florida's Community Colleges 1972-73, published by the Department
of Education, Tallahassee.

Up to July 1, 1973, authority for Staff and Program Develop-
ment was S 230.767 Florida Statutes. The State Board of Education
regulations and directives from the Division of Community Colleges
provided administrative assistance. Funding then was at a rate
of three percent of salaries.

Under new funding procedures, Staff and Program Development
authorization is removed from law. State Board of Education
Regulations (6A-8.761) now provide the authority for the SPD
program and provide the allocation formula. Further direction
for administration rests with the Division of Community Colleges.
The program is funded at the rate of two percent of the
previous year's apportionment for current operation. The two
percent is an add-on to the portion appropriated to a school
from the money earned by FTE formula. So SPD money is clearly

not intended for normal costs but for "training and start-up money," according to President Herbert Phillips of Lake City Community College who has watched its operation since the beginning.

The framers of the SPD program in Florida wisely saw staff and program development as interconnected. For programs, the emphasis was clearly on initiating and planning new programs, not expanding old ones. For staff, the improvement in competencies might include "interacting and updating experiences in human relations, in occupational skills, in subject matter, in teaching techniques, in foundation disciplines, and in resources utilization." "Staff" was defined to include all personnel employed by the colleges.

Each college had to submit a broad Five Year Goals Plan for staff and program development, which was to be updated annually. Also, each college must submit an Activity Plan with a budget summary and an Activity Evaluation for each discrete activity.

The thrust of SPD was to be on innovation and improvement. Funding new positions with SPD money is limited to a maximum of three years. Purchasing new equipment was similarly restricted to program initiation and improvement with a limit of fifteen percent for hardware. Preparation for accreditation self-study was also prohibited.

Yet within these restrictions the number and variety of activities supported is amazing--faculty have been helped to attend off-campus seminars and professional meetings, to continue professional study, or to develop a new curriculum approach or

to mediate a course.

Some SPD activities have been pointed towards reaching
potential students or keeping the ones we have in school.
Brevard Community College supported a Mobile Recruiting Unit.
Lake City Community College set up a Career Information Center.
A school wide tutorial program and student advising program
using peers has also aided our retention at Lake City. Students
have helped to implement and test the dividing of basic science
courses into modules. Start-up costs for our instructional
mini-computer system were partially defrayed by SPD money. This
included paying the technician to devise and keep the system in
operation and certain basic equipment. President Phillips
commented, "Computer-Assisted Instruction is a new teaching
tool at Lake City Community College, and it would have been
impossible to start without SPD monies."

Coordination of the statewide program is through a system
of SPD coordinators with one from each community college. In
the majority of cases, the SPD money is administered from the
President's office, Dean's office, or Development office. Some
other colleges use faculty evaluation panels. In a recent
coordinators' conference our faculty chairman found out that
Lake City Community College was the only college to have both
faculty evaluation and faculty responsibility for the adminis-
tration and financial bookkeeping. Mrs. Burnette serves without
pay as our Chairman of Steering and Planning Committee, composed
of elected faculty. A major responsibility of this committee on
committees is SPD fund administration. The Development Officer
also serves on the committee to provide advice as to how the
SPD program relates to the entire grants posture of the college.

Any faculty member may make a proposal to the committee for support by filling out an Activity Plan. Each desired activity must have two readings before the faculty committee. Generally, this proponent makes a brief presentation or is available to answer questions as to the goals, objectives, and procedures, evaluation, and budget for the activity. The proposed Activity should mesh with the Five Year Plan and yearly goals of the college. By keeping a close eye on the budget our coordinator is able to give the committee guidance on the number of projects which can be approved.

Our Steering and Planning Committee itself administers "Project Lift," an SPD activity for faculty. Travel to professional meetings, or to view a successful program at another school to get ideas, or even to pay one-half tuition for a professional course is provided for a faculty member who can justify his request.

The last area of staff development I wish to sketch quickly is our committee method of generating ideas and helping to execute a federal or state proposal. I have found that in grants involving a substantial institutional commitment, it is best to form a committee from all affected areas of the college. A chairman is elected who may eventually become the project officer. Three planning meetings with a time schedule are then set up. At the first planning meeting, the Development Officer explains the guidelines. A consultant in the subject matter of the grant may make a presentation to provide expertise. Assignment will then be given out to committee members for:

a. the problem and specific facts from subject areas

b. goals and objectives

c. implementing procedures

d. evaluation

e. budget materials

Each committee member then presents at the second meeting his position paper covering points a - e. This meeting is a working session to spot discrepancies in program, purposes, and budget. Considerable faculty growth is encouraged in this interchange of ideas from various disciplines.

At the third meeting the Development Officer presents an edited version of the committee papers approximating the guidelines of the proposal. This full committee provides the final feedback. From there the proposal goes to the President for institutional approval.

I have found this committee method clears up a great many misunderstandings, encourages staff growth in preparing position papers, and helps to select a project officer. It is a viable institutional method for proposal development which provides staff growth at the same time.

Faculty Development Meetings 1973-74

1. May 30, 1974
   Faculty All, "Behavior Objectives for Psycho-Motor
   and Affective Areas and the Systems Approach." Dr.
   H. H. McAshan, University of North Florida.

2. April 18, 1974
   Faculty All, "Individualization of Education and the
   Implications of Open Admissions," Dr. John Roueche,
   Prof. of Educational Administration, and Director, Jr.
   College Leadership Program, University of Texas at Austin.

3. March 11, 1974
   Faculty All, "Non-Punitive Grading Systems" Dr. Clyde
   Clements, and panel discussion with Dean Parnell, Dean
   Attaway and Compensatory Education Task Force.

4. February 11, 1974
   CLMS Committee Progress Report to the Faculty, Tom Rowand,
   Chairman; Unit 1, MBTI, Ch. Graham Anthony; Unit 2, Career
   Guidance-Admissions, Ch. Martha Brown; Unit 3, Testing,
   Ch. Clark Hardman; Unit 4, Learning Prescription, Ch. Dean
   Parnell; Unit 5, Master Records, Ch. President Phillips;
   Unit 6, Individualized CAI modules of instruction, faculty;
   Bill Alexander, Dean Attaway, Dr. Clyde Clements, Dale
   Drew, John Griffith, Paul Gunning, Robert McDonald, Dean
   Parnell, Jeanne Rehberg, Dave Richards, Tom Rowand, Wiley
   Russell, Frank Sedmera.

5. January 29, 1974
   CLMS Committee Workshop (Open to Faculty) Learning
   Prescriptions (Matching Teaching Styles-Learning Styles)
   and Career Guidance Matching "behavioral characteristics"
   to career requirements - Dr. Mary McCaulley, Division of
   Allied Health, Department of Clinical Psychology, Typology
   Laboratory, University of Florida.

6. January 15, 1974
   Faculty All "Goals and Philosophy of the Florida
   Community College Movement" Dr. James Wattenbarger,
   Professor of Higher Education, University of Florida,
   and director of the Institute of Higher Education.

7. December 10, 1973
   "FRCCA - An Innovative Approach to Regional Educational
   Services: The NSF Computer Assisted Instruction Training
   Consortium." Mr. Robert Moore, Project Director.

8. November 12, 1973
   "What's New in the Transfer Division" Dean Parnell and
   Faculty.

9. October 29, 1973
   "Media Overview," Tom McCracken

10. October 8, 1973
    "Performance Objectives," Dr. Clyde Clements

11. August 18, 1973
    "Orientation to CAI Programs Available to Faculty/Staff
    via Instructional Mini Computer System and FRCCA Network,
    (University of Florida Terminal)."

12. August 3, 1973
    "Management by Objectives Program and Demonstration of
    2 Self-Paced Instructional Packages." Dr. Wayne Scott.